

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on November 21, 2003. Claims 20-36 were pending in the application. The Examiner rejected claims 20-22, 24-27 and 29-36 and objected to claims 23 and 28. With this amendment, claims 29 and 30 are canceled, claim 26 is amended and the remaining claims are unchanged in the application.

On page 2 of the office action, the Examiner objected to claim 26 on formal grounds, indicating that a space needed to be provided between the words "tag" and "associated". The claim has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's request.

On pages 2 and 3 of the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 29 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Barrett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,222,137). Those claims have been canceled.

Of the remaining claims, claims 20 and 31 are independent claims. The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Parkinson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,088,457) in view of Barrett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,222,137). On page 5 of the office action, the Examiner rejected independent claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of the same references. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection.

In order to enable a pager to receive messages, Parkinson et al. sets a timer circuit for a time-out period. When the timer circuit has run for the specified time, the time-out period lapses and the timer circuit provides a signal to the processing logic 304 to disable the processing logic. Parkinson does this in order to save power. For instance, Parkinson may set the timer logic for a five-minute time-out period and then transmit a message to the pager. The pager can then shut down so that it need not look for additional messages, once the time-out period has elapsed.

By contrast, the present invention is fundamentally different. Instead of setting a timer circuit, both independent claims 20 and 31 of the present invention provide a data structure that includes an expiration date portion that holds an expiration date. In claim 20, the expiration date indicates an expiration date for an address, and in claim 31, the expiration date corresponds to a service group code. Of course, these expiration dates are stored in a computer readable data structure.

Therefore, the present invention enables a user to subscribe to a service for, for example, a month. The mobile device will simply discard messages received after the expiration date. This is neither shown nor suggested by Parkinson, and it is in complete contradiction to the purpose sought by Parkinson. Instead of simply storing an expiration date in a computer readable data structure, Parkinson sets timer logic. Parkinson does this in order to purportedly save power. If Parkinson were to set the timer logic for, for example, a month, the Parkinson device would necessarily require the timer logic to be active and running for a month. This would, of course, result in greater power usage, rather than power savings.

In contrast, the present invention simply programs a computer readable medium with an expiration date in a data structure. Messages received after the expiration date are discarded. No such data structure is disclosed by Parkinson or Barrett. Therefore, Applicant submits that independent claims 20 and 31 are allowable. Reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 20 and 31 are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 21-28 and 32-36 depend either directly or ultimately from the independent claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that those claims are allowable as well. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 20-28 and 31-36 are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By:


Joseph R. Kelly, Reg. No. 34,847
Suite 1600 - International Centre
900 Second Avenue South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

JRK:slg